

BAUMGARTEN'S *MEDITATIONES* AS A COMMENTARY ON HORACE'S *ARS POETICA*

Bengerd Juul Thorsen

(Aarhus University)

1. Introduction

In his 1735 *Habilitationsschrift*, *Meditationes Philosophicae de Nonnullis ad Poema Pertinentibus*, Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten draws to a great extent on previous thinkers. The poetic theory of Horace is a particularly important inspiration. That in itself is not surprising: Horace was at the time considered the theorist of poetics *par excellence* and was the main point of reference for several of the other key art theorists in the period, amongst them Boileau-Despreaux and his *L'Art Poétique*, Gottsched and his *Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst für die Deutschen* and Bodmer and Breitinger's *Von dem Einfluss und dem Gebrauche der Einbildungskraft, zur Ausbesserung des Geschmacks* to mention just a few. In *Meditationes*, though, Horace's text is integrated into Baumgarten's theory to a far greater extent than is the case with the theory of his contemporaries. In some passages of *Meditationes* it can be hard to distinguish who is actually proposing a given argument: Baumgarten or Horace. In this work, Horace is not only used as a point of reference. His text is literally integrated into Baumgarten's text, in some instances even replacing Baumgarten's own claims, explanations or examples. Further, Baumgarten is not only inspired by the content of *Ars Poetica*, but also mimics the form of Horace's work.

Because of this close relation between the two texts, one must expect Baumgarten to have an opinion on how to interpret Horace's text (as a theory and a poem). Thus, an investigation of Baumgarten's use of Horace's *Ars Poetica* is relevant to a more general investigation of Baumgarten's theory.

This study has the following scopes:

- a) to analyze how Horace's text is applied: what contexts is it used in, what was its context in the original use in Horace, and does this new application contribute in any way to the understanding of Baumgarten's and/or Horace's texts?

and

- b) through this, to investigate which traditions in Horace scholarship at Baumgarten's time he agrees with – which is not irrelevant since we are dealing with a period in art theory where practically everybody seems to utilize Horace's text in forming their arguments and ideas.

From a list of books in Baumgarten's possession at the time of his death, the *Catalogus Librorum a Viro Excellentissimo Amplissimo Alexandro Gottlieb Baumgarten Prof. Philos. Celeberrimo Suos et Amicorum in Usus Comparatorium*, (printed by J.C. Winther in Frankfurt, in 1762), we get a hint of what books were considered important by Baumgarten in his scholarly work. In this catalogue, we find numerous publications related to Horace; and although we cannot be certain that these works were in Baumgarten's possession at the time of the execution of *Meditationes*, it does give us an idea of which editions and commentaries on Horace Baumgarten regarded as important or merely useful. In the following, I will describe the various traditions of Horace scholarship at the time. Furthermore, I will give a brief introduction to the works in Baumgarten's library and, focusing on these, I will examine the relation between Horace's text and Baumgarten's readings of it. This will enable me to determine if and how Baumgarten's understanding of Horace's text may be influenced by the commentaries on Horace in his possession.

For this purpose, I examine quotations from *Ars Poetica* found in paragraphs of Baumgarten's work, in which he introduces concepts that will later on become key concepts in his aesthetic theory. I examine these particular instances for the following reasons: a) these preliminary versions of the concepts are the foundation of his system of metaphysics and thus present us with early versions of these ideas, thereby making the impact of Horace all the more significant. This also means that these quotations are the ones where an inspiration from the scholarly works on Horace is most influential; and b) these paragraphs are the parts of Baumgarten's text, in which excerpts from Horace's text are mainly used.

The notions in question are:

- 1) *phantasia/phantasmata* (I focus on the description in § XXIX),
- 2) *heterocosmica* (in the paragraphs §§ LVI and LVII) and
- 3) *methodus lucida* (in the paragraphs §§ LXX, LXXI and LXXIII).

But let us first take a look at Horace's position in art theory at the time.

2. Horace's position at the time of Baumgarten

Horace's poetics, the *Ars Poetica*, was the most important work on poetry (at least until translations of Aristotle and Longinus gained popularity in the 16th and 18th centuries). As a result, the commentaries on this work and the various poetological considerations in these were of great importance to the understanding of poetics and art theory from the Middle Ages up until Baumgarten's time, when the influence of rationalist thinking caused a shift towards an increased focus on art forms, and the autonomy of art, and a growing interest in Baumgarten's notion of *aesthetics*.

Up to that point, commentaries on Horace's *Ars Poetica* constituted a significant forum for discussions of and inspiration for poetics, and up until Boileau (see below) these commentaries were the forum for the general discourse on poetics and poetry. Even after new works devoted entirely to poetics emerged from Boileau onwards, the interpretive commentaries with a special interest in the instructive qualities of the poem continued to have some importance to poetological scholarship (see below). Thus, in order to understand not only Baumgarten's use of Horace, but also the view on poetry it articulates, it is important to take into consideration the commentaries on the work, on which Baumgarten relies so heavily.

As already mentioned, at the time of Baumgarten art theories relied on Horace's poetics, *Ars Poetica*. This is not entirely true, inasmuch as Aristotle and Longinus were slowly gaining attention as can be seen in some works of poetics of the time.¹ Nevertheless, Horace is the dominant figure not only for the poetics, but also for the production of poetry. The popularity of his works is linked to the fact that he was on the curriculum in most schools and generally held an important place in the education

¹ Boileau's translation of Περὶ ὕψους, *On the Sublime* (1674), was the beginning of the increasing interest in Longinus that culminated in 18th century Romantic poetry.

system.² Wolfgang J. Pietsch examines the German poet Hagedorn and his relation to Horace. In his analyses he explains that: “Horats-kenntniß war ein Teil jenes Bildungsgutes, das weit über den Kreis von Schulmännern, Philologen und Literaten hinausreichte”.³ In the school system, Horace served as a role model, not only with regard to literacy and poetry, but also morally and philosophically.⁴ He was furthermore imitated by numerous poets, amongst them Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski (1595-1640), who Baumgarten cites in *Meditationes* (as the only contemporary poet).⁵ Pietsch describes Horace as “‘Lieblingspoet’ der Epoche” (favourite poet of the epoch), and further describes how: “[...] unter den römischen Autoren gerade Horaz im 18. Jahrhundert die intensivste Wiederbelebung erfuhr, liesse sich durch statistische Beobachtungen leicht nachweisen”.⁶

Viëtor names the époque “die dritten, endgültigen Rezeption des Horaz” (the third, definitive reception of Horace),⁷ and Ogilvie says that “The eighteenth century breathed Horace”,⁸ while Gian Biagio Conte adds that: “for the vernacular poetry from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, Horace provides the dominant model [...]” and later adds that “Imitations in Horatian metres were also composed in Latin especially in the seventeenth century”.⁹

² Grafton writes: “Horace’s position in the school’s curriculum helped him survive the advent of Romanticism, longer than many other Latin authors”, Anthony Grafton (ed.), *The Classical Tradition*, Harvard: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010, p. 157.

³ “Familiarity with Horace was an established part of basic knowledge in every general education, which reached far beyond the circle of school masters, philologists and the literati.” Wolfgang J. Pietsch, “Friedrich von Hagedorn und Horaz. Untersuchungen zur Horaz-Rezeption in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts”, *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft* 2 (1988), p. 1.

⁴ “Diese Autoritäts – und Vorbildfunktion, welche die Alten lange Zeit hatte, wird besonders in den Poetiken von der Renaissance bis zur Aufklärung deutlich”. *Ibid.*, p. 6. In Baumgarten we see this in his frequent use of Horace in the forming of his ethics, *Ethica Philosophica*.

⁵ § LXIV and § LXXX. It is no big surprise that Sarbiewski was engaged in poetic theory.

⁶ “Among the Roman authors Horace went through the most intensive revival in the 18th century, is evident from statistic observations”. Pietsch, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁷ Cited according to Pietsch. The fourth period is Renaissance, the second is Baroque.

⁸ Cited according to Anthony Grafton (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 457.

⁹ Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature. A History*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994, p. 319.

3. The commentary tradition

It is not only in the fields of poetic production and art theory that we detect this great interest in Horace. There is also a particularly high level of activity in scholarly publications at the time: the number of text editions, commentaries, school editions, treatises, comparative analyses, polemic disputes etc. is vast, and many of these publications are very popular and have been translated into several languages and published in several editions.

In a description of the earliest poetic theories in the Middle Ages, Karsten Friis-Jensen writes that "Horace's influence in the art of poetry must be seen in the light of contemporary exegesis". This point is made about the tradition in the Middle Ages, but Horace's ongoing impact on poetics and theory makes it equally relevant to examine the exegesis of Horace in the commentary tradition at the time of Baumgarten. Thus, Friis-Jensen's point holds for Baumgarten's reading of Horace as well. Scholarly readings (like those found in his *catalogus librorum*, see below), provided Baumgarten with knowledge of and inspiration for his own interpretations of Horace. And since Baumgarten's understanding of Horace's *Ars Poetica* is important to his overall project, so are these scholarly readings. Thus, there are several layers of scholarly exchange at stake in Baumgarten's use of *Ars Poetica*. In the following, I will briefly introduce the development in the tradition of commentaries on *Ars Poetica* with a special focus on the commentaries in Baumgarten's time.

The commentaries of the Middle Ages seek to extract as many useful instructions in poetic writing as possible. This kind of interpretation forms the basis for the status of the work at the time of Baumgarten and to some extent influence the current common view on the work. These readings of *Ars Poetica* in the Middle Ages are interesting because *Ars Poetica* is not an instructive or didactic poem. As Friis-Jensen writes: "Horace's AP can only with difficulty be forced to yield clear-cut pieces of advice for the budding poet, but eleventh and twelfth century commentators actually managed to elicit these".¹⁰ The best known of these commentaries is the French standard commentary known as the *Materia Commentary* (dated 1125-75). Friis-Jensen characterizes this work as "the 'missing link' between Horace and the new arts of poetry", since it is in the *Materia Commentary* that we first meet the popular interpretation of *Ars Poetica* as an enumeration of virtues and errors, *virtutes* and *vitia*, for the poet and his poetry. The *Materia Commentary*, in contrast to the other commentaries of

¹⁰ Friis-Jensen, "Petrarch and the Medieval Horace", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl. XXV*, Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1997, p. 300.

its time, not only interprets the *Ars Poetica* as a useful instruction, but further identifies and lists a set of rules for poetry and for the poet to aim at. These rules, called *praecepta*, are largely mirrored in the instructions of Baumgarten's *Meditationes*. The *Materia Commentary* had a great influence on several poetics of the Middle Ages, e.g. John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* (1156-59), Matthew of Vendôme's *Ars Versificatoria* (c. 1175), and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria Noua* (c. 1208-13). However, they are considered autonomous works of poetic theory that exceeded Horace (!), composed on the basis of Horace's text.

In *A New English Horace – die Übersetzungen der horazischen Ars Poetica der Restaurationszeit* (Frankfurt, 1971), Bernfried Nugel examines the reception of Horace's text in editions and commentaries from the 14th century to the 17th century. He subdivides the period into three: early (1471-1545), middle (1545-1595) and more recent (1595-1685). The early period is influenced by the invention of print,¹¹ leading to the widespread collation and distribution of texts and commentaries. It becomes common practice to publish texts accompanied by the commentaries of Acron and Porphyryon (and later Landino's as well) in the same volume. Knowledge of the work is greatly expanded with Badius Ascensius' *De Arte Poetica Opusculum Aureum, ab Ascensio Familiariter Expositum* (Paris, 1503), which is a commentary solely on *Ars Poetica*. The middle period is influenced by an increasing interest in the poetics of Aristotle and is characterized by readings of *Ars Poetica* focusing on Aristotelian features. According to Nugel, this heightens the level of interpretation: "In der Einzelkommentaren der mittleren Periode des *Ars Poetica*-Tradition erreicht die gedankliche und literarkritische Diskussion der *Ars Poetica* ihr höchstes Niveau".¹²

The late period leads up to Baumgarten's time and contains some of the commentaries that are found in Baumgarten's *catalogus librorum*. It is marked by new preferences in the readings, with the common trait that they read the work in a conceptual framing, focusing on Aristotelian interpretations, minimalistic text internal analysis, or the overall structure of the work. One widely popular, although not particularly innovative, commentary at that time is the school commentary of Johannes Minelli (1653), which divides the text into *praecepta* and points out all its rhetorical figures.

¹¹ The first printed edition of Horace's *Opera Omnia* was published in Venice in 1471.

¹² "In the single commentaries in the middle period of the *Ars Poetica*-tradition, the intellectual and literary-critical discussion of the *Ars Poetica* obtains its highest level". Nugel, *A New English Horace – die Übersetzungen der horazischen Ars Poetica der Restaurationszeit*, Frankfurt: Athenäum Verlag, 1971, p. 23.

In the period 1681-89, the French philologist André Dacier translates and comments the entire opus of Horace, a work that gains popularity in several countries and becomes the point of departure for most subsequent research in Horace. Dacier's commentary is comprehensive, detailed, and contains an overview of the commentary tradition thus far. However, Dacier's enthusiasm for his subject, whom he considers almost omniscient, makes him rather biased. Nevertheless, Dacier's edition is described as the most important French edition of all time. The commentary by Noël-Étienne Sanadons (1728) is highly influenced by Dacier's, but it is aimed at school readings.

4. Books on Horace in Baumgarten's Library

In the library catalogue we find André Dacier's commentary, which was first published in 1681-89, in its fourth edition from 1727. This edition is considerably expanded, as also declared in its title.¹³ In Dacier, the conceptual framing for the reading is Horace's poetological and meta-literary remarks found in *Ars Poetica*, but also in the odes and his remaining work. This meta-literary interest is further developed in the fourth edition, which comprises a 130-page introduction: "Traité de la Poësie Lyrique, de son origine, de son caractere, de changemens qui lui sont arrivez jusqu'à ce qu'elle soit parvenue à sa perfection, & des Poëtes qui l'ont cultivée".¹⁴ This introductory treatise is a chronological exposition of lyric poetry in the Greek and Roman world, focusing on Horace with references to the poetics of Aristotle and Cicero and in particular Quintilian's poetics on genre. It is not itself a poetics, but rather an account and descriptive presentation of the genre of lyric poetry. It is, however, interesting that in his introduction to Horace's work, Dacier uses terms that are newly coined in literary theory. Dealing with Quintilian's 10th book, he talks about "l'esprit, le jugement & le bon gout" (mind, judgment and good taste), concepts that were introduced approximately at the time of Dacier by Gracien y Morales, Bouhours and König. The word "methode" also occurs (see below). Hence, Dacier's descriptive treatise on Greek and Roman poetry does mention interpretive terms from contemporary theory.

¹³ The first edition's title is: "Oeuvres d'Horace en latin et en françois avec remarques critiques et historiques par Mr. Dacier tom. 1-10" whereas the title of the fourth edition is extended with "revûë, corrigée & augmentée considerablement".

¹⁴ "Treatise on lyric poetry, on its origin, on its distinctive character, on transformations it has undergone until that, which was successful in its perfection, and on the poets that cultivated it". *Ibid.*

In the catalogue we also find an assembled commentary, consisting of commentaries by Mancinelli, Acron, Porphyryon and Badius, listed as *Horatius cum Commentarius* [sic!] *Ant. Mancinelli et aliorum. Venetiis* [1]495. The text was very popular and was reprinted in this version several times, one as late as 1707. Mancinelli's commentary was originally published as a separate work, but was soon incorporated into the assembled commentary. Mancinelli considered his commentary to be of stoic orientation, and this could easily explain its popularity in a scholarly environment, which regarded the view of stoic morality as being in agreement with its own Christian values.

The catalogue also mentions François Blondel's *Comparaison de Pindare et d'Horace* (1673), which more generally describes Horace and his opus, and thus may have influenced Baumgarten's view on Horace as a writer. This work – rather unconventionally – contains considerations on contemporary poets.

In my examinations, I have included two further works that, although not found in the *catalogus librorum*, enjoyed widespread popularity at the time and thereby may have had potential influence – directly or indirectly – on Baumgarten's understanding of Horace. These are: *Q. Horatii Flacci de Arte Poëtica Liber ad Pisones cum commentariis joh. Min-Elli; Praemisso Aldi Manutii De Metris Horatanis Tractatu* and *Les Poésies d'Horace Disposées Suivant l'Ordre Cronologique et Traduites en François: Avec des Remarques et des Dissertations Critiques par R.P. Sanadon*. Both are described above.

In other words, Baumgarten's library contained commentaries from a wide range of dates and with a great variety of focus. These are the works that I will include in my examination of the excerpts in the following.

5. First example: On the notion of *phantasmata*

The argument in the main section of § XXIX is a further development of an argument introduced in the preceding paragraph. To put it briefly (too briefly), Baumgarten here argues that *phantasmata* are reproduced sensory impressions and are not in themselves related to sense, making them a sort of secondary sense impression. In Baumgarten's system this makes *phantasmata* less clear – and hence less poetic – than sensory impressions. Simply because sensory impressions *affect* us, *phantasmata* only recall these affections. The argument in the main section is:

Phantasmata are less clear than sense impressions, therefore, less poetic § 17. Therefore, since aroused affects determine sense impressions, a poem which arouses affects is more perfect than one which is full of dead *phantasmata*, §§ 8, 9, and it is more poetic to arouse affects than to produce *phantasmata*.¹⁵

In the sub-section Baumgarten introduces his explanation of the above claim by citing Horace: "It is not enough for poems to be beautiful: they must also be charming and lead the mind of the listener where they please".¹⁶

With this statement, Horace accentuates that the quality of a poem is not its beauty but its ability to lead the soul, that is: to affect. This statement is related to Baumgarten's claim in the paragraph: that the poem is more poetic if it affects than if it merely produces *phantasmata* (*affectus movere magis poeticum, quam alia phantasmata producere*). In order to see the full scope of how Baumgarten produces meaning in his interpretation and application of Horace here, we now turn to other readings of this passage.

In his commentary, Dacier focuses on what Horace describes in *quocunque volent, animum auditoris agunto*. Dacier interprets this as a demand for the poem to "touche & n'emeut" (touch and move). He then emphasizes that this quality in the poem is "le là but principal de ce Poëme" (the primary aim of this poem). He goes on to further point out that Boileau in *L'Art Poétique* describes what this excerpt examines, with the phrase *non simulacra neque imitamenta, sed luctus verus, atque lamenta vera & spirantia*. Thus, in Boileau we see a clear distinction between a first order of impression (which is true) and a second-order representation. Since Dacier mentions Boileau as part of his own argument here, it is likely that Dacier's interpretation is in accordance with what Boileau presents. Dacier further points out that *pulchra* relates to "le style" (the manner), while *dulcia* relates to "les mouvemens" (the affections) and "la passion".

The meaning that is attributed to Horace's text in Baumgarten's use of it here is in agreement with what Dacier and, through him, Boileau, associates it with. There has, so to speak, been an exchange of ideas

¹⁵ Baumgarten, *Reflections on Poetry*, translated with the original text, Introduction and Notes by K. Aschenbrenner & W. B. Holtner, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954, p. 48-49. I leave the Latin terms for Baumgarten's notions (e.g. *phantasmata*) untranslated instead of replacing them with English approximations (e.g. "image"), thereby risking the distortion, reduction or alteration of the meaning of the terms in question.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

between the three readers of Horace. Baumgarten comments on this exchange through his use of the text: he defines *phantasmata* as “reproduced sense impression”, which in my opinion means he is following Boileau’s (and through him, Dacier’s) distinction between a first order of representation (the one Baumgarten describes as *affectus movere*, Dacier as “les mouvemens”, and Boileau as *sed luctus verus, atque lamenta vera & spirantia*) and a second order of representation (the one Baumgarten describes as *phantasmata producere*, Dacier as “le style”, and Boileau as *non simulacra neque imitamenta*). One might even argue that Baumgarten’s own concept could be influenced somewhat by the issues discussed in these commentaries. At least it seems that Baumgarten agrees on the significance ascribed to the quotation (Dacier’s “le là but principal de ce Poëme”), since he utilizes it in the formulation of one of his own key concepts.

6. Second example: On the notion of *heterocosmica*

The second example is from the passage introducing the concept of *heterocosmica*. This concept describes how the abovementioned *phantasmata*, when combined into so-called *fictions* (fictions), may be a) true, b) utopic or c) something in between: *heterocosmic*. A heterocosmic fiction is not true in this world, but could be – in another world. The wording in the main section is:

Fictions in which there is much that is mutually inconsistent are utopian, not heterocosmic, § 52; hence there is nothing self-contradictory in poetic fictions, § 53.¹⁷

This paragraph is a rephrasing and compilation of a definition (§ 52) and a claim (§ 53) that only true and heterocosmic fictions are poetic. The sub-paragraph contains a series of quotations from *Ars Poetica*. The quotation of interest to us is: “so skillfully does he invent, so cleverly blend fact and fiction, that the middle is not discordant with the beginning, nor the end with the middle”.¹⁸

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

¹⁸ Baumgarten begins his excerpt here with the words “so that it can also be said as it is said of Homer”. Here he addresses the reader of the text as if the reader were an aspiring poet. However, we know that this was a *habilitationsschrift* so this address is most likely a genre trait by which Baumgarten aims to mimic Horace’s style addressing the reader in the 2nd person as an aspiring poet. The mimic and poetic qualities of the *Meditationes* are very strong.

This excerpt from *Ars Poetica* elaborates on the *convenientia* described earlier in the sub-section and *sibi invicem repugnat* ("mutually inconsistent") in the main section: a fiction containing mutually contradictory elements will be constructed so that those elements (beginning, middle and end) are not harmonious. Thus *figmenta heterocosmica* are explained using Horace's text.

In Dacier's commentary, the point of Horace's texts here is described as "très-important, & le fondement du Poëme Epique". Dacier interprets the excerpts as: "dans le Poëme Epique, la fiction marche toujours avec la verité". He further elaborates that there exist three different elements of truth in poetry and that these truths are surrounded by "beaux mensonges" (beautiful lies). These "beaux mensonges" will make the truths more fantastic and thus more appealing.

Despite the fact that Baumgarten's paragraph does not deal directly with truth and lie, but rather argues that a poem should not be self-contradictory, Dacier's point here expresses what Baumgarten sought to demonstrate in the main paragraph and with his concept of "heterocosmic": Baumgarten and Dacier demand that poetry should consist of a combination of something generally held to be true and something else, and that the application of this "something else" (in Dacier the "beaux mensonges", in Baumgarten something marvelous) ensures the poetic qualities in the poem. One could argue that with Dacier's description of "beaux mensonges" we find a thematic link to the previous example on *phantasmata*: the lies must be beautiful, according to Dacier, and *phantasmata* were just connected to Horace's *pulcher* in the above.

7. Third example. On the notion of *methodus lucida*

The third and last example in this small analysis is from the passage introducing Baumgarten's *methodus lucida*. The words *methodus lucida* deliberately allude to Horace's term *lucidus ordo*, which stems from the same passage that Baumgarten cites in the paragraph.

Baumgarten's *methodus lucida* describes how the poet ought to structure his poem in order to make it as poetic as possible, including how the poem may pass from one sort of subsidiary method to another throughout the poem, these subsidiary methods being: methods of memory, knowledge or reason. In § LXXIII, the main section explains that if there is a conflict between the method of memory (*memoria*) or the method of knowledge (*ingenium*) and the general precepts for poetry, then it is more poetic to pass from one method to another.

The sub-section is opened with a quotation from Horace, which serves as a transition to Baumgarten's succeeding explanation of the main

section. The excerpt is introduced by: “We may so interpret Horace, when, though hesitantly, he lays down the rules for *ordo*”,¹⁹ which is a claim that Baumgarten’s point in the main section explains to us how the Horace in the sub-section should be understood. Thus Baumgarten’s own point is not only valid within his own work, but is also an interpretation of Horace. The excerpt is as follows: “This, unless I am very wrong, will be the excellence and charm of *ordo*: let the poet say right now what must be said right now, and reserve and defer, for the present, a great deal else.”²⁰

After the excerpt, Baumgarten presents us with another reading. It goes as follows:

The things that “must be said” are those required by the method of wit or memory or reason – whichever was employed in what has gone before. Certain things the poet “says now,” since there is *ordo* and *methodus* in the poem. Besides these methods or methods made up from them, scarcely any others can be conceived of. Certainly, then, the various parts of the poem must be combined by means of one or another of them. The poet “reserves for the present” because what follows from another *ordo* of thought is more suitable to the perfection of the poem and to that extent more poetic. We may concede that Horace had no *distinct* conceptions either of *methodus lucida* or any other, but there ought to be no doubt here about the true sense, provided that our conceptions represent the poet’s, albeit perhaps more distinctly. See Wolff, *Logica*, § 929.²¹

Baumgarten thus admits that Horace did not have concepts for the methods, but at the same time accentuates that the thoughts presented in the excerpts are in agreement with Baumgarten’s understanding (which he calls *sensus legitimus*, true/legitimate sense).²² The interpretations of Horace here, then, consist of Baumgarten transferring his own notions to the descriptions in Horace’s text.

Baumgarten first explains that what ought to be said (*debentia dici*) can be juxtaposed with that which *methodus ingenii*, *memoriae* or *rationis* demand. Baumgarten further explains about this *debentia dici* that since the poem follows one of the three (or a combination of them),

¹⁹ *Ordo* here referring to the above mentioned *lucidus ordo*. Baumgarten, *Reflections on Poetry*, p. 65.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² This, however, is only true, he states, if Baumgarten’s notions describe the same as Horace’s.

the parts of the poem should be connected according to one of these and that this is the reason why it “says now” (*nunc dicit*) that which should be said. Finally, he explains that “reserves for the present” (*nunc vero differt*) is a way to describe the idea that one particular (organized) train of thought serves the perfection of the poem best.²³ Whatever lies outside of this train of thought does not serve to make the poem more poetic and thus has its place somewhere else. In this case, then, Baumgarten explicitly explains that his text serves as an interpretation of Horace, as well as explaining how this interpretation is to be understood. This makes it all the more relevant to consider how this interpretation is related to the others of his time.

Dacier writes about the passage on *lucidus ordo* that “c’est un nouveau precepte qu’il a fait sur la pratique des plus grands Auteurs de l’antiquité, & que personne n’en avoit parlé avant lui”.²⁴ He regards the sentence *ut iam nunc dicat, iam nunc debentia dici* as two parts describing two elements of content: that which is said right now and that which should be postponed. Dacier explains that Horace characterizes *ordo* for the poem as opposed to the *ordo* of prose, and states about this precept that “Horace découvre ici un des plus grand secrets de la Poësie”.²⁵ According to Dacier, the *lucidus ordo* is something particularly new and a conceptual innovation which characterizes a known practice among poets. Dacier further identifies dispositions to this idea in Longinus, and mentions that Vida describes something related in the 11th book of his poetics.

Dacier’s introductory remark that Horace’s sentence consists of two elements is equivalent to what Baumgarten actually does in his reading of the sentence: he develops his analysis of the two respectively and interprets them within his own understanding of order and method and their mutual relation. And here we remember that Dacier was actually aware of the term “methode” and used it in his introductory treatise. Dacier actually uses the word again to describe Horace’s poetic *ordo*. Now, I will not claim that Baumgarten takes over this combination of *lucidus ordo* and “methode” from Dacier, but it seems their understanding of Horace’s *ordo* in relation to contemporary theory is equivalent.

²³ In accordance with his previous statement on the poem.

²⁴ Dacier, *Oeuvres d’Horace en latin et en françois...*, *liber nonus*, ad. 42.

²⁵ “Horace here discovers one of the greatest secrets of poetry”. *Ibid.*, ad. 43.

Dacier's remark that *lucidus ordo* is a "nouveau precepte" (new precept) may, together with the remark on *ut iam nunc dicat, iam nunc debentia dici* that "Horace découvre ici un des plus grand secrets de la Poësie",²⁶ contribute to Baumgarten's connecting his own and Horace's concepts in his description of the structure of the poem and to the fact that he uses precisely the word *lucidus* in his definition of the method of the poetic. In this way, he not only connects his definition of poetry to Horace's renowned description of poetry (as we have already seen in the previous examples), but at the same time he also (via Dacier's interpretation of this passage in Horace) points to the radicalism of his own new concept: the *methodus lucida* is, just like Horace's concept, a concept that describes the specifically poetic. And such a radical redefinition of *the poetic* is precisely the aim of *Meditationes*.

Furthermore, to Horace the concept of *lucidus ordo* was a way of entering into a dialogue with the contemporary literary theory of his time. By employing the word *ordo* he borrowed from the terminology of the system of rhetoric of his contemporaries. In the same way Baumgarten enters into a dialogue not only with Horace (and through him Aristotle), but, by employing the word "method", also with contemporary theory.

The fact that Baumgarten interprets Horace's text within the paragraph of his own text is also interesting because it shows how he regards his project on a larger scale – as a way to connect his new rationalist inspired definition of poetry with the renowned and fully accepted description of poetry in classicist poetics – and how he utilizes Horace's *Ars Poetica* for that purpose. As Baumgarten's analysis of the excerpt unfolds, he also explains it within his own newly invented terminology, so that the interpretation of the text not only serves as a way of proving the legitimacy of his own claim, but also shows how the two sets of poetological terminologies are compatible. In this paragraph, Baumgarten actually states that his method surpasses Horace's *lucidus ordo*, because it is "far more distinct" (*forte distinctius*). This bold claim, in my opinion, must be inspired by the claim of radicalism that Dacier presents in his interpretation of the passage.

8. Conclusion

The exemplifying analyses above show how, on several occasions, there seems to be a relation between the way Baumgarten utilizes Horace's *Ars Poetica* as part of his arguments in his *Meditationes* and the exegeses of these same passages in the commentaries listed in Baumgarten's *catalogus librorum*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

In the first example, Baumgarten seems to use the quotation to exemplify something that is not stated in the text but by consulting the commentaries we find that this interpretation of Baumgarten's seems to be in accordance with a common way of understanding the passage at the time, and Baumgarten's claim in the paragraph then accounts for what the commentaries regard as the quotation's meaning. In the second example there seems to be more of an overall thematic resemblance to the ideas Baumgarten wishes to express with his concept. So reading the commentaries does not add to our understanding of Baumgarten's text or of how he utilizes Horace's text. But it does confirm a resemblance in interpretation.

In the third case, we see a repetition of what seems to be one of the more important aspects of Baumgarten's use of Horace: to legitimize the overall project by drawing from the authority of the predecessors. This time, though, with the further implication that in the same way Horace had rhetoric theory as his point of departure and expanded its concepts in order to make them apply to poetry, Baumgarten utilizes Horace's text in the same way: he expands the concepts of Horace's poetics theory, thus pointing towards himself as not only equally valuable, but rather as a surpasser of Horace. This, however, only becomes fully clear once we consider the remarks on the passage found in Dacier's commentary.

I hope that these few examples have demonstrated that the development of the early stages of Baumgarten's aesthetic theory did not only apply Horace's *Ars Poetica* as a matter of convention or form, but that Baumgarten, through the applications and interpretations of these excerpts of Horace's text, also develops and discusses his aesthetic key notions and places himself among the most important theorists and scholars. Thus, the scholarly discussions on the *Ars Poetica* on which the art theories of the time were based may contribute to these art theories in a more or less deliberate manner. In a broader perspective this suggests that early art theories and their key concepts is not only developed in the exchange of ideas between art theoretical works of the time, but may be equally generated in a reciprocal dialogue with commentaries.

Bibliography

- BAUMGARTEN, Alexander Gottlieb, *Meditationes Philosophicae de Nonnullis ad Poema Pertinentibus*, Halle: Johann Heinrich Grunert. Cited according to Aschenbrenner, 1735.
- BAUMGARTEN, Alexander Gottlieb, *Reflections on Poetry*, translated with the original text, Introduction and Notes by Karl Aschenbrenner & William B. Holther, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.

- BENTLEY, Richard, *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex recensione et cum notis Richard Bentleii*, Amsterdam: Wetstein, 1713.
- BLONDEL, François, *Comparaison de Pindare et d'Horace*, Paris: Claude Barbin, 1673.
- BRINK, C.O., *Horace on Poetry The 'Ars Poetica'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- CONTE, Gian Biagio, *Latin Literature. A History*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- DACIER, André, *Oeuvres d'Horace en latin et en français avec remarques critiques et historiques par Monsieur Dacier tom. 1-10 revûë, corrigée & augmentée considerablement par l'auteur*, Amsterdam: Frères Wetstein, 1727.
- FRIIS-JENSEN, Karsten, "Petrarch and the Medieval Horace", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici, Suppl. XXV*, Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1997, pp. 83-98.
- FRIIS-JENSEN, Karsten, "Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry", *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 3*, Tübingen: Gunther Narr Verlag, 1995, pp. 360-401.
- GRAFTON, Anthony (ed.), *The Classical Tradition*, Harvard: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- HARRISON, Stephen (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- KJØRUP, Søren & Per Aage Brandt (ed. & transl.), *Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten Filosofiske Betragtninger over Digtet* Copenhagen: Arena, 1968.
- MINELLI, J., *Q. Horatii Flacci de Arte Poetica Liber ad Pisones cum commentariis Joh. Min-Ellii; Præmisso Aldi Manutii de Metris Horatianis Tractatu*, Francofurti & Hafniae: Apud Joh. Justum Erythropilum, 1698.
- MIRBACH, Dagmar (ed. & transl.), *Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten Ästhetik Lateinisch-deutsch. Übers., mit einer Einführung, Anmerkungen und Registern hrsg. Von Dagmar Mirbach*, Hamburg: Meiner Verlag, 2007.
- NUGEL, Bernfried, *A New English Horace – die Übersetzungen der horazischen Ars Poetica der Restaurationszeit*, Frankfurt: Athenäum Verlag, 1971.
- PAETZOLD, Heinz (ed. & transl.), *Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten Meditationes Philosophicae de Nonnullis ad Poema Pertinentibus. lateinisch-deutsch. Philosophische Betrachtungen über einige Bedingungen des Gedichtes*, Hamburg: Meiner Verlag, 1983.
- PIETSCH, Wolfgang J., "Friedrich von Hagedorn und Horaz. Untersuchungen zur Horaz-Rezeption in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts", *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft 2*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1988.
- SANADON, Noël-Étienne, *Les Poësies d'Horace Disposées Suivant l'Ordre Cronologique et Traduites en François: Avec des Remarques et des Dissertations Critiques par R.P. Sanadon*, Paris: Chaubert, 1728.
- SHACKLETON BAILEY, D.R. (ed.), *Quintus Horatius Flaccus Opera*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

WINTHER, J.C., *Catalogus Librorum a Viro Excellentissimo Amplissimo Alexandro Gottlieb Baumgarten Prof. Philos. Celeberrimo Suos et Amicorum in Usus Comparatorum*, Frankfurt: Winther, J.C, 1762.

ABSTRACT

In his first work, the poetics *Meditationes philosophicae de nonnullis ad poema pertinentibus*, Baumgarten frequently cites Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Horace was highly esteemed by Baumgarten and his contemporaries, especially in the fields of poetics and art theory. Baumgarten uses *Ars Poetica* throughout *Meditationes*, but it is especially in the paragraphs introducing some of the key concepts of his philosophy that there is a significant amount of excerpts from Horace's poetics. In this article, I examine if and how contemporary scholarly interpretations may have influenced these uses of Horace's text and maybe even Baumgarten's theory. Following a brief account of relevant commentaries as well as Horace's position in contemporary art theory, I explore the implied interpretations of *Ars Poetica* in Baumgarten's excerpts, focusing on his three key terms, *phantasia*, *heterocosmica* and *methodum lucidam*. Compared to the conception of Horace as expressed in the commentaries, this study suggests a complex interaction between those and Baumgarten's art theory.

Keywords: Horace, art theory, *phantasia*, *heterocosmica*, *methodum lucidam*

RESUMO

No seu primeiro trabalho, o poemático *Meditationes philosophicae de nonnullis ad poema pertinentibus*, Baumgarten cita frequentemente a *Ars Poetica* de Horácio. Horácio era bastante apreciado por Baumgarten e pelos seus contemporâneos, especialmente nos campos da poética e da teoria da arte. Baumgarten usa a *Ars Poetica* ao longo da obra *Meditationes*, mas é especialmente nos parágrafos que introduzem determinados conceitos-chave da sua filosofia que há uma quantidade significativa de excertos da poética horaciana. Neste artigo, examino se e como as interpretações académicas coetâneas podem ter influenciado estes usos do texto de Horácio e até mesmo a teoria de Baumgarten. Após uma breve abordagem a comentários relevantes, bem como à posição de Baumgarten na teoria da arte contemporânea, exploro as interpretações da *Ars Poetica* nos excertos de Baumgarten, incidindo especialmente nos seus termos-chave *phantasia*, *heterocosmica* e *methodum lucidam*. Comparado com a concepção de Horácio, tal como surge nos comentários, este estudo sugere uma complexa interacção entre estes e a teoria da arte de Baumgarten.

Palavras-chave: Horácio, teoria da arte, *phantasia*, *heterocosmica*, *methodum lucidam*